uses. Resolution 68-16 further requires that: "Any activity which produces or may produce or increase volume or concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained."

- Pollution is defined in the California Water Code as an alteration of water quality to a degree which unreasonably affects beneficial uses. In California, Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) contain water quality standards and objectives which are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan for California's Central Valley Regional Water Board states that: "According to Section 13050 of the California Water Code, Basin Plans consist of a designation or establishment for the waters within a specified area of beneficial uses to be protected, water quality objectives to protect those uses, and a program of implementation needed for achieving the objectives. State law also requires that Basin Plans conform to the policies set forth in the Water Code beginning with Section 13000 and any state policy for water quality control. Since beneficial uses, together with their corresponding water quality objectives, can be defined per federal regulations as water quality standards, the Basin Plans are regulatory references for meeting the state and federal requirements for water quality control (40 CFR 131.20)."

- Nuisance is defined in the California Water Code as anything which is injurious to health, indecent, offensive or an obstruction of the free use of property which affects an entire community and occurs as a result of the treatment or disposal of waste.

The Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) allows water quality to be lowered as long as beneficial uses are protected (pollution or nuisance will not occur), best practicable treatment and control (BPTC) of the discharge is provided, and the degradation is in the best interest of the people of California. Water quality objectives were developed as the maximum concentration of a pollutant necessary to protect beneficial uses and levels above this concentration would be considered pollution. The Antidegradation Policy does not allow water quality standards and objectives to be exceeded. Mixing zone are regions within public waters adjacent to point source discharges where pollutants are diluted and dispersed at concentrations that routinely exceed water quality standards.

The Antidegradation Policy (Resolution 68-16) requires that best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) of the discharge be provided. Mixing zones have been allowed in lieu of treatment to meet water quality standards at the end-of-the-pipe prior to discharge. To comply with the Antidegradation Policy, the trade of receiving water beneficial uses for lower utility rates must be in the best interest of the people of the state and must also pass

the test that the Discharger is providing BPTC. By routinely permitting excessive levels of pollutants to be legally discharged, mixing zones act as an economic disincentive to Dischargers who might otherwise have to design and implement better treatment mechanisms. Although the use of mixing zones may lead to individual, short-term cost savings for the discharger, significant long-term health and economic costs may be placed on the rest of society. An assessment of BPTC, and therefore compliance with the Antidegradation Policy, must assess whether treatment of the wastestream can be accomplished, is feasible, and not simply the additional costs of compliance with water quality standards. A BPTC case can be made for the benefits of prohibiting mixing zones and requiring technologies that provide superior waste treatment and reuse of the wastestream.

EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook states that: "It is not always necessary to meet all water quality criteria within the discharge pipe to protect the integrity of the waterbody as a whole." The primary mixing area is commonly referred to as the zone of initial dilution, or ZID. Within the ZID acute aquatic life criteria are exceeded. To satisfy the CWA prohibition against the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts, regulators assume that if the ZID is small, significant numbers of aquatic organisms will not be present in the ZID long enough to encounter acutely toxic conditions. EPA recommends that a ZID not be located in an area populated by non-motile or sessile organisms, which presumably would be unable to leave the primary mixing area in time to avoid serious contamination.

Determining the impacts and risks to an ecosystem from mixing pollutants with receiving waters at levels that exceed WQS is extremely complex. The range of effects pollutants have on different organisms and the influence those organisms have on each other further compromises the ability of regulators to assess or ensure "acceptable" short and long-term impacts from the use of mixing zones. Few if any mixing zones are examined prior to the onset of discharging for the potential effects on impacted biota (as opposed to the physical and chemical fate of pollutants in the water column). Biological modeling is especially challenging – while severely toxic discharges may produce immediately observable effects, long-term impacts to the ecosystem can be far more difficult to ascertain. The effects of a mixing zone can be insidious; impacts to species diversity and abundance may be impossible to detect until it is too late for reversal or mitigation.

The *CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 10, WATER, SEC. 2* states that: "It is hereby declared that because of the conditions prevailing in this State the general welfare requires that the water resources of the State be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use of water be prevented, and that the conservation of such waters is to be exercised with a view to the reasonable and beneficial use thereof in the interest of the people and for the public welfare. The right to water or to the use or flow of water in or from any natural stream or water course in this State is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable use or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water. Riparian rights in a stream or water course

attach to, but to no more than so much of the flow thereof as may be required or used consistently with this section, for the purposes for which such lands are, or may be made adaptable, in view of such reasonable and beneficial uses; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be construed as depriving any riparian owner of the reasonable use of water of the stream to which the owner's land is riparian under reasonable methods of diversion and use, or as depriving any appropriator of water to which the appropriator is lawfully entitled. This section shall be self-executing, and the Legislature may also enact laws in the furtherance of the policy in this section contained." The granting of a mixing zone is an unreasonable use of water when proper treatment of the wastestream can be accomplished to meet end-of-pipe limitations. Also contrary to the California Constitution, a mixing zone does not *serve the beneficial use;* to the contrary, beneficial uses are degraded within the mixing zone.

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan, page IV-16.00, requires the Regional Board use EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control (TSD)* in assessing mixing zones. The TSD, page 70, defines a first stage of mixing, close to the point of discharge, where complete mixing is determined by the momentum and buoyancy of the discharge. The second stage is defined by the TSD where the initial momentum and buoyancy of the discharge are diminished and waste is mixed by ambient turbulence. The TSD goes on to state that in large rivers this second stage mixing may extend for miles. There are drinking water intakes, and proposed intakes, downstream of the wastewater discharge which could be impacted prior to the pollutants from the discharge are completely mixed. The TSD, Section 4.4, requires that if complete mix does not occur in a short distance mixing zone monitoring and modeling must be undertaken.

The State's *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (SIP), Section 1.4.2.2, contains requirements for a mixing zone study which must be analyzed before a mixing zone is allowed for a wastewater discharge. Properly adopted state Policy requirements are not optional. The proposed Effluent Limitations in the Permit are not supported by the scientific investigation that is required by the SIP and the Basin Plan.

SIP Section 1.4.2.2 requires that a mixing zone shall not:

1. Compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody.
2. Cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life.
3. Restrict the passage of aquatic life.
4. Adversely impact biologically sensitive habitats.
5. Produce undesirable aquatic life.
6. Result in floating debris.
7. Produce objectionable color, odor, taste or turbidity.
8. Cause objectionable bottom deposits.
9. Cause Nuisance.
10. Dominate the receiving water body or overlap a different mixing zone.
11. Be allowed at or near any drinking water intake.

The Permit's mixing zones have not addressed a single required item of the SIP. To the contrary the San Joaquin River is already 303d listed for numerous constituents. A very clear unaddressed requirement (SIP Section 1.4.2.2) for mixing zones is that the point(s) in the receiving stream where the applicable criteria must be met shall be specified in the Permit. The "edge of the mixing zone" has not been defined.

The SIP states, on page 16, that dilution credits and mixing zones for incompletely mixed discharges shall be considered by the Regional Board only after the Discharger has completed an independent mixing zone study. Mixing zones or dilution credits were improperly allowed for dibromochloromethane, bromodichloromethane, manganese, molybdenum and nitrate plus nitrite. Few mixing zones are adequately evaluated to determine whether the modeling exercise was in fact relevant or accurate, or monitored over time to assess the impacts of the mixing zone on the aquatic environment. The sampling of receiving waters often consists of analyzing one or two points where the mixing zone boundary is supposed to be – finding no pollution at the mixing zone boundary is often considered proof that mixing has been "successful" when in fact the sampling protocol might have missed the plume altogether.

**M. The Permit fails to contain protective Effluent Limitations for aluminum in accordance with Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44, US EPA's interpretation of the regulation, and California Water Code, Section 13377.**

Aluminum in the effluent has been measured and the Regional Board has found that there is a reasonable potential to exceed water quality standards. Aluminum has been shown to be toxic to freshwater aquatic life. Freshwater Aquatic habitat is a beneficial use of the receiving stream. The Basin Plan contains a narrative water quality objective for toxicity that states in part that "[a]*ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life*" (narrative toxicity objective). U.S. EPA developed National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum. The recommended four-day average (chronic) and one-hour average (acute) criteria for aluminum are 87 mg/*l* and 750 mg/*l*, respectively.

The argument has been repeatedly made that US EPA's 87 ug/l chronic criterion was developed using low pH and hardness testing and should not be used. The Permit cites the ambient criteria document as it relates to the low hardness and pH but fails to follow the final EPA recommendation that the criteria be used unless a cite specific criteria is developed. As is stated in EPA's development document, (Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum, EPA 440/5-86-008) the pH was in the range 6.5 to 6.6. The hardness was below 20 mg/l; however the Permit does not contain a discharge limitation for hardness and numerous effluents and receiving waters within the Central Valley experience hardnesses at or below this level. Despite the hardness and pH values used in the development of the criteria; the simple fact is that U.S. EPA recommends that application of the ambient criteria as necessary to be protective of the aquatic beneficial uses of receiving waters in lieu of site-specific criteria.

Based on information included in analytical laboratory reports submitted by the Discharger, aluminum in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a level necessary to protect aquatic life, and, therefore to violate the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(i), requires that; "Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality." US EPA has interpreted 40 CFR 122.44(d) in *Central Tenets of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permitting Program* (Factsheets and Outreach Materials, 08/16/2002) that although States will likely have unique implementation policies there are certain tenets that may not be waived by State procedures. These tenets include that "where valid, reliable, and representative effluent data or instream background data are available they MUST be used in applicable reasonable potential and limits derivation calculations. Data may not be arbitrarily discarded or ignored." The California Water Code (CWC), Section 13377 states in part that: "...the state board or the regional boards shall...issue waste discharge requirements... which apply and ensure compliance with ...water quality control plans, or for the protection of beneficial uses..." Section 122.44(d) of 40 CFR requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. A water quality standard for Failure to include an effluent limitation for aluminum based on the chronic criteria in the Permit violates 40 CFR 122.44 and CWC 13377.

## N. The Permit Contains an Inadequate Reasonable Potential by Using Incorrect Statistical Multipliers

Federal regulations, 40 CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(ii), state "when determining whether a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numeric criteria within a State water quality standard, the permitting authority shall use procedures which account for existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, **the variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the effluent**, the sensitivity of the species to toxicity testing (when evaluating whole effluent toxicity), and where appropriate, the dilution of the effluent in the receiving water." Emphasis added.

Attachment G: The reasonable potential analysis fails to consider the statistical variability of data and laboratory analyses as explicitly required by the federal regulations. The Permit utilizes the simple method of whether the existing maximum effluent concentration has exceeded the water quality standard instead of the required multiplier factors necessary to properly evaluate reasonable potential. The procedures for computing variability are detailed in Chapter 3, pages 52-55, of USEPA's *Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control.*

The reasonable potential analyses are flawed and must be recalculated. The fact that the SIP illegally ignores this fundamental requirement does not exempt the Regional Board from its obligation to consider statistical variability in compliance with federal regulations.

**O. Contrary To The Findings In The Permit There Are Not Limitations For Toxicity Although Required By Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (D) To Achieve Compliance With WQLSs For Unknown Toxicity In The Receiving Stream. The Permit Does Not Contain Numeric Effluent Limitations For Chronic Toxicity And Therefore Does Not Comply With Federal Regulations, At 40 CFR 122.44 (D)(1)(I) And The *Policy For Implementation Of Toxics Standards For Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, And Estuaries Of California* (SIP). The Permit Also Contains An Acute Toxicity Discharge Limitation That Allows 30% Mortality Granting A Mixing Zone Absent Any Analysis.**

The Permit, Finding H, properly cites that the receiving stream, the San Joaquin River is a *Water Quality Limited Segment* (WQLSs) for unknown toxicity. The Permit, Findings G and H, also properly cites that Federal Regulation 40 CFR 122.44 (d) requires that permit are required to contain limitations more stringent than technology based limitations where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards and to achieve compliance in WQLSs. Permit Finding H is incorrect however in citing that toxicity limitations are included in the Permit. The Permit, *C Special Provisions 2 Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements, a, Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity,* requires: "For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing..." Sampling does not limit the discharge and does not constitute a limitation. Contrary to the Findings in the Permit there are not limitations for toxicity although required by Federal Regulations 40 CFR 122.44 (d) to achieve compliance with WQLSs for unknown toxicity in the receiving stream.

Permit, State Implementation Policy states that: "On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP."

The SIP, Section 4, Toxicity Control Provisions, Water Quality-Based Toxicity Control, states that: "A chronic toxicity effluent limitation is required in permits for all

dischargers that will cause, have a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to chronic toxicity in receiving waters." The SIP is a state *Policy* and CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy.

Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality. There has been no argument that domestic sewage contains toxic substances and presents a reasonable potential to cause toxicity if not properly treated and discharged. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/ San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00) for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. The Permit was revised to contain a narrative limitation prohibiting toxicity but then states that additional sampling and starting a toxicity reduction analysis is sufficient for compliance. The Permit states that: "...to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the discharger is required to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing...". However, sampling does not equate with or ensure compliance. The Tentative Permit requires the Discharger to conduct an investigation of the possible sources of toxicity if a threshold is exceeded. This language is not a limitation and essentially eviscerates the Regional Board's authority, and the authority granted to third parties under the Clean Water Act, to find the Discharger in violation for discharging chronically toxic constituents. An effluent limitation for chronic toxicity must be included in the Order. In addition, the Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series should bracket the actual dilution at the time of discharge, not use default values that are not relevant to the discharge.

Permit is quite simply wrong; by failing to include effluent limitations prohibiting chronic toxicity the Permit does not "...implement the SIP". The Regional Board has commented time and again that no chronic toxicity effluent limitations are being included in NPDES permit until the State Board adopts a numeric limitation. The Regional Board explanation does not excuse the Permit's failure to comply with Federal Regulations, the SIP, the Basin Plan and the CWC. The Regional Board's Basin Plan, as cited above, already states that: "...waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses..." Accordingly, the Permit must be revised to prohibit chronic toxicity (mortality and adverse sublethal impacts to aquatic life, (sublethal toxic impacts are clearly defined in EPA's toxicity guidance manuals)) in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i) and the Basin Plan and the SIP.

Under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), states are required to classify surface waters by *uses* – the beneficial purposes provided by the waterbody. For example, a waterbody may be designated as a drinking water source, or for supporting the growth and

propagation of aquatic life, or for allowing contact recreation, or as a water source for industrial activities, or all of the above. States must then adopt *criteria* – numeric and narrative limits on pollution, sufficient to protect the uses assigned to the waterbody. Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), adopted to require implementation of the CWA, require that limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality. The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento/ San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), Water Quality Objectives (Page III-8.00), for Toxicity is a narrative criteria which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life and as stated above the receiving stream is a WQLS for unknown toxicity. This section of the Basin Plan further states, in part that, compliance with this objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms (toxicity tests).

The Permit requires that the Discharger conduct acute toxicity tests and states that compliance with the toxicity objective will be determined by analysis of indicator organisms. However, the Tentative Permit contains a discharge limitation that allows 30% mortality (70% survival) of fish species in any given toxicity test. Surely, mortality is a detrimental physiological response to aquatic life.

In receiving streams where dilution may be available the primary mixing area is commonly referred to as the zone of initial dilution, or ZID. Within the ZID acute aquatic life criteria are exceeded. To satisfy the CWA prohibition against the discharge of toxic pollutants in toxic amounts, regulators assume that if the ZID is small, significant numbers of aquatic organisms will not be present in the ZID long enough to encounter acutely toxic conditions. The allowance of 30% mortality will result in acute toxicity within the ZID. Before the discharge can be allowed a complete mixing zone analysis is required in accordance with the Basin Plan and the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (SIP) to show that discharge limitations prevent toxicity; such an analysis has not been completed. CWC Sections 13146 and 13247 require that the Board in carrying out activities which affect water quality shall comply with state policy for water quality control unless otherwise directed by statute, in which case they shall indicate to the State Board in writing their authority for not complying with such policy. The State Board has adopted the SIP and the Regional Board is required to the Policy.

US EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 104, that:

> "When setting a whole effluent toxicity limit to protect against acute effects, some permitting authorities use an end-of-pipe approach. Typically these limits are established as an LC50>100% effluent at the end of the pipe. These limits are routinely set without any consideration as to the fate of the effluent and the concentrations of toxicant(s) after the discharge enters the receiving water. Limits

derived in this way are not water quality based limits and suffer from significant deficiencies since the toxicity of a pollutant depends mostly upon concentration, duration of exposure, and repetitiveness of the exposure. This is especially true in effluent dominated waters. For example, an effluent that has an LC50=100% contains enough toxicity to be lethal up to 50% of the test organisms. If the effluent is discharged to a low flow receiving waterbody that provides no more than a three fold dilution at the critical flow, significant mortality can occur in the receiving water. Furthermore, such a limit could not assure protection against chronic effects in the receiving waterbody. Chronic effects could occur if the dilution in the receiving water multiplied by the acute to chronic ratio is greater than 100 percent. Therefore, in effluent dominated situations, limits set using this approach may be severely underprotective. In contrast, whole effluent toxicity limits set using this approach in very high receiving water flow conditions may be overly restrictive."

Following US EPA's rationale the limitations of allowing 70% survival (30% mortality) in acute toxicity tests, as is the case in the cited LC50, will result in the allowance of toxic discharges to ephemeral streams, which is representative of the receiving waters at Davis. While the State and Regional Board's method of prescribing an effluent limitation of 70% percent survival may be protective in waterbodies with significant dilution; such a limitation should be subject to a complete mixing zone analysis. For an ephemeral receiving stream a mixing zone analysis would not be applicable under worst case dry stream conditions. The Order should be revised to require the Regional Board to prohibit acute toxicity (100% survival as compared to the laboratory control) in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i).

With regard to WET testing variability; US EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* states, on page 11, that:

> "In summary, whole effluent toxicity testing can represent practical tests that estimate potential receiving water impacts. Permit limits that are developed correctly from whole effluent toxicity tests should protect biota if the discharged effluent meets the limits. It is important not confuse permit limit variability with toxicity test variability" (emphasis added)

The Permit must be revised to prohibit acute toxicity, require 100% survival in toxicity tests, in accordance with Federal regulations, at 40 CFR 122.44 (d)(1)(i), the CWA, the SIP, the CWC and the Basin Plan.

5. THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PETITIONERS ARE AGGRIEVED.

CSPA is a non-profit, environmental organization that has a direct interest in reducing pollution to the waters of the Central Valley. CSPA's members benefit directly from the waters in the form of recreational hiking, photography, fishing, swimming, hunting, bird watching, boating, consumption of drinking water and scientific

investigation. Additionally, these waters are an important resource for recreational and commercial fisheries.

Central Valley waterways also provide significant wildlife values important to the mission and purpose of the Petitioners. This wildlife value includes critical nesting and feeding grounds for resident water birds, essential habitat for endangered species and other plants and animals, nursery areas for fish and shellfish and their aquatic food organisms, and numerous city and county parks and open space areas.

CSPA's members reside in communities whose economic prosperity depends, in part, upon the quality of water. CSPA has actively promoted the protection of fisheries and water quality throughout California before state and federal agencies, the State Legislature and Congress and regularly participates in administrative and judicial proceedings on behalf of its members to protect, enhance, and restore declining aquatic resources.

CSPA member's health, interests and pocketbooks are directly harmed by the failure of the Regional Board to develop an effective and legally defensible program addressing discharges to waters of the state and nation.

6. THE SPECIFIC ACTION BY THE STATE OR REGIONAL BOARD WHICH PETITIONER REQUESTS.

Petitioners seek an Order by the State Board to:

A. Vacate Order No. R5-2008-0154 (NPDES No. CA0079138) and remand to the Regional Board with instructions prepare and circulate a new tentative order that comports with regulatory requirements.
B. Alternatively; prepare, circulate and issue a new order that is protective of identified beneficial uses and comports with regulatory requirements.

7. A STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEGAL ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION.

CSPA's arguments and points of authority are adequately detailed in the above comments and our 7 and 22 September 2008 comment letters. Should the State Board have additional questions regarding the issues raised in this petition, CSPA will provide additional briefing on any such questions.

The petitioners believe that an evidentiary hearing before the State Board will not be necessary to resolve the issues raised in this petition. However, CSPA welcomes the opportunity to present oral argument and respond to any questions the State Board may have regarding this petition.

8. A STATEMENT THAT THE PETITION HAS BEEN SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL BOARD AND TO THE DISCHARGERS, IF NOT THE PETITIONER.

A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent electronically and by First Class Mail to Ms. Pamela Creedon, Executive Officer, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, 11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114.

A true and correct copy of this petition, without attachment, was sent to the Discharger in care of: Mr. Mark Madison, Director of Municipal Utilities, City of Stockton, 2500 Navy Drive, Stockton, CA 95206-1191.

9. A STATEMENT THAT THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE PETITION WERE PRESENTED TO THE REGIONAL BOARD BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD ACTED, OR AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE PETITIONER COULD NOT RAISE THOSE OBJECTIONS BEFORE THE REGIONAL BOARD.

CSPA presented the issues addressed in this petition to the Regional Board in 7 September 2008 and 22 September 2008 detailed comment letters that were accepted into the record.

If you have any questions regarding this petition, please contact Bill Jennings at (209) 464-5067 or Michael Jackson at (530) 283-1007.

Dated: 23 November 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Jennings, Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Attachment No. 1: Order No. R5-2008-0154

CALIFO . .A REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • FAX (916) 464-4645
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

# ORDER NO. R5-2008-0154
# NPDES NO. CA0079138

# WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CITY OF STOCKTON REGIONAL WASTEWATER CONTROL FACILITY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Discharger** | City of Stockton |
| **Name of Facility** | Regional Wastewater Control Facility |
| **Facility Address** | 2500 Navy Drive |
| | Stockton, CA 95206 |
| | San Joaquin |
| The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a major discharge. | |

The discharge by the City of Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

| Discharge Point | Effluent Description | Discharge Point Latitude | Discharge Point Longitude | Receiving Water |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 001 | Tertiary treated municipal wastewater | 37° 56' 15" N | 121° 20' 5" W | San Joaquin River |

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on: | **23 October 2008** |
| This Order shall become effective on: | **12 December 2008** |
| This Order shall expire on: | **1 October 2013** |
| The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than: | **180 days prior to the Order expiration date** |

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **23 October 2008.**

Original signed by Pamela C. Creedon

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

EXHIBIT A

## Table of Contents



### List of Tables



### List of Attachments

## I. FACILITY INFORMATION

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 4. Facility Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Discharger** | City of Stockton |
| **Name of Facility** | Regional Wastewater Control Facility |
| **Facility Address** | 2500 Navy Drive |
| | Stockton, CA 95206 |
| | San Joaquin County |
| **Facility Contact, Title, and Phone** | Mark Madison, Director, (209) 937-8750 |
| **Mailing Address** | SAME |
| **Type of Facility** | Publicly Owned Treatment Works |
| **Facility Design Flow** | 55 million gallons per day (mgd) |

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Regional Water Board), finds:

A. **Background.** The City of Stockton (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R5-2002-0083 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0079138. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 29 September 2006, and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 55 million gallons per day (mgd) of treated wastewater from the City of Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility, hereinafter Facility. The application was deemed complete on 28 February 2007.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the "discharger" or "permittee" in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

B. **Facility Description.** The Discharger owns and operates the Stockton Regional Wastewater Control Facility. The Facility provides primary treatment consisting of screening, grit removal, and primary sedimentation, and secondary treatment consisting of high rate trickling filters and secondary clarifiers. The secondary treated effluent is piped under the San Joaquin River to the tertiary level treatment facility, which consists of facultative ponds, engineered wetlands, two nitrifying biotowers, dissolved air flotation, mixed-media filters, and chlorination/dechlorination facilities. Several of the ponds are operated in a stand-by mode of operation as necessary, to achieve improved effluent quality by decreasing solids loading on the downstream treatment process, and by maintaining stable ammonia loading to the nitrifying biotowers.

Sludge is removed from the primary and secondary sedimentation processes to gravity thickeners for preliminary water removal, and then pumped to anaerobic digesters. After digestion, the treated sludge is pumped to a lagoon where anaerobic digestion continues. A dredge is used to pump the concentrated material from the bottom of the lagoon to a belt filter press and dewatered biosolids are removed by a private contractor off-site for agricultural reuse.

Wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point No. 001 (see table on cover page) to the San Joaquin River, a water of the United States, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

C. **Legal Authorities.** This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (CWC) (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

D. **Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E, G, and H are also incorporated into this Order.

E. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under CWC section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100-21177.

F. **Technology-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)[1] require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at Part 133. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).

G. **Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement that are necessary to achieve water quality standards. The Regional Water

[1] All further statutory references are to title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

Board has considered the factors listed in CWC Section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using: (1) USEPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the State's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

H. **Water Quality Control Plans.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised February 2007), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Beneficial uses applicable to San Joaquin River are as follows:

**Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

| Discharge Point | Receiving Water Name | Beneficial Use(s) |
|---|---|---|
| 001 | **San Joaquin River** | Existing:<br>Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply (AGR) including both irrigation and stock watering; industrial process supply (PRO); industrial service supply (IND); water contact recreation (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); warm freshwater aquatic habitat (WARM); cold freshwater aquatic habitat (COLD); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); wildlife habitat (WILD); and navigation (NAV). |

The Basin Plan includes a list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "*...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.).*" The Basin Plan also states, "*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to WQLSs. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.*" The Delta is divided into multiple WQLSs. The Facility discharges directly into the southern portion and just upstream of the Stockton Deep Water Ship

Channel (DWSC). The listing for both WQLSs are applicable to the discharge. The WQLSs are 303(d) listed for: chloropyrifos, DDT, diazinon, dioxin, EC, exotic species, furan compounds, group A pesticides, mercury, pathogens, PCBs, and unknown toxicity. Effluent Limitations for EC, mercury, pathogens, and toxicity are included in this Order.

A total maximum daily load (TMDL) for oxygen demanding substances in the DWSC was adopted by the Regional Water Board on 27 January 2005 (Resolution No. R5-2005-0005). The TMDL was approved by the State Water Board on 16 November 2005 and approved by the USEPA on 27 February 2007. Wasteload allocations for oxygen demanding substances, specifically ammonia, carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand ($CBOD_5$), and dissolved oxygen (DO), have not been apportioned; however, this Order contains effluent limits for these constituents until the Regional Water Board establishes final effluent limitations.

Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

I. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** USEPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000 USEPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

J. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000 the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005 that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.

K. **Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with CWA section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board has concluded that where the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan allows for schedules of compliance and the Regional Water Board is newly interpreting a narrative standard, it may include schedules of compliance in the permit to meet effluent limits that implement a narrative standard. See In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements for Avon Refinery (State Water Board Order WQ 2001-06 at pp. 53-55). See also Communities for a Better Environment et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, 34 Cal.Rptr.3d 396, 410 (2005). The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES

permits for water quality objectives that are adopted after the date of adoption of the Basin Plan, which was 25 September 1995 (see Basin Plan at page IV-16). Consistent with the State Water Board's Order in the CBE matter, the Regional Water Board has the discretion to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when it is including an effluent limitation that is a "new interpretation" of a narrative water quality objective. This conclusion is also consistent with the USEPA policies and administrative decisions. See, e.g., Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a schedule of compliance, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to Water Code section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to Water Code section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Basin Plan, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as practicable to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

For CTR constituents, Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that, based on a discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for an existing discharger to achieve immediate compliance with an effluent limitation derived from a CTR criterion, compliance schedules may be allowed in an NPDES permit. Unless an exception has been granted under section 5.3 of the SIP, a compliance schedule may not exceed 5 years from the date that the permit is issued or reissued, nor may it extend beyond 10 years from the effective date of the SIP (or 18 May 2010) to establish and comply with CTR criterion-based effluent limitations. Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation exceeds 1 year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter. Where allowed by the Basin Plan, compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations or discharge specifications may also be granted to allow time to implement a new or revised water quality objective. This Order does not include compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations and/or discharge specifications. A detailed discussion is included in the Fact Sheet.

L. **Alaska Rule.** On 30 March 2000 USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes. (40 CFR §131.21; 65 Fed. Reg. 24641 (27 April 2000).) Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after 30 May 2000 must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by 30 May 2000 may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.

M. **Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.** This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The applicable technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on $CBOD_5$ and total suspended solids (TSS). The applicable water quality-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on aluminum, ammonia, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, chlorodibromomethane, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, manganese, molybdenum, nitrate, and pathogens. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement

the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order includes effluent limitations for $CBOD_5$, TSS, and pathogens to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). In addition, the Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on 1 May 2001. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to 30 May 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to 30 May 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act*" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

N. **Antidegradation Policy.** Section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 is consistent with the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

O. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40 CFR section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed. Some effluent limitations in this Order are less stringent than those in the previous Order. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) this relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

P. **Endangered Species Act.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act

(16 U.S.C.A. sections 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

Q. **Monitoring and Reporting.** Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and state requirements. This Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

R. **Standard and Special Provisions.** Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet.

The Regional Water Board has determined pollution prevention is necessary to achieve compliance with water quality objectives for total dissolved solids (for salinity), and mercury. In accordance with Water Code section 13263.3(d)(C), this Order requires the Discharger to develop pollution prevention plans for these pollutants.

S. **Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.C., V.B, and VI.C.4.a. of this Order are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.

T. **Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe Waste Discharge Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

U. **Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**, that Waste Discahrge Requirements Order No. R5-2002-0083 and Cease and Desist Order No. R5-2002-0084 are rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the CWC (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

## III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

A. Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings is prohibited.

B. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).

C. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.

D. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

## IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

### A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 001

#### 1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. 001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point No. 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E):

a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 6:

**Table 6. Effluent Limitations**

| Parameter | Units | Effluent Limitations | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Average Monthly | Average Weekly | Maximum Daily | Instantaneous Minimum | Instantaneous Maximum |
| Aluminum, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 311 | | 750 | | |
| Ammonia, Total (as N) | mg/L | 2 | -- | 5 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day[1] | 917 | -- | 2294 | -- | -- |
| Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | µg/L | 1.8 | -- | 3.6 | -- | -- |

| Parameter | Units | Effluent Limitations | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Average Monthly | Average Weekly | Maximum Daily | Instantaneous Minimum | Instantaneous Maximum |
| Chlorodibromomethane | µg/L | 5.0 | -- | 16 | -- | -- |
| Total Coliform Organisms | MPN/100ml | -- | -- | -- | -- | 240 |
| Cyanide, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 4.1 | -- | 9.0 | -- | -- |
| Dichlorobromomethane | µg/L | 6.8 | -- | 20 | -- | -- |
| Manganese, Total Recoverable | µg/L | | -- | 286 | -- | -- |
| Molybdenum, Total Recoverable | µg/L | | -- | 13 | -- | -- |
| Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 40 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| pH | s.u. | -- | -- | -- | 6.5 | 8.5 |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | mg/L | 10 | 15 | 20 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day[1] | 4,590 | 6,885 | 9,180 | -- | -- |
| 5-Day CBOD @ 20 °C | mg/L | 10 | 15 | 20 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day[1] | 4,590 | 6,885 | 9,180 | -- | -- |

[1] Mass-based effluent limitations are based on a design flow of 55 mgd.

b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of CBOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids shall not be less than 85 percent.

c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

   i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
   ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.

d. **Temperature.** The maximum temperature of the discharge shall not exceed the natural receiving water temperature by more than 20°F.

e. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:

   i. 0.01 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
   ii. 0.02 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.

f. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:

   i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
   ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period.

g. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The Average Dry Weather Flow shall not exceed 55 mgd.

h. **Dissolved Oxygen.** The daily average effluent dissolved oxygen concentration shall not be less than 6.0 mg/L from 1 September through 30 November and 5.0 mg/L throughout the remainder of the year.

i. **Aluminum.** The discharge of total recoverable aluminum shall not exceed a concentration of 200 µg/L as an annual average.

j. **Electrical Conductivity.**

i. The electrical conductivity in the discharge shall not exceed an annual average of 1,300 µmhos/cm;

ii. If the Discharger fails to comply with the requirements in 1) or 2), below, the electrical conductivity in the discharge shall not exceed a monthly average of 700 µmhos/cm (1 April to 31 August), and 1000 µmhos/cm (1 September to 31 March):

1) The Discharger shall develop and submit a Salinity Plan as specified in Provision VI.C.3.c; and

2) The Discharger shall timely implement the Salinity Plan upon the Regional Water Board's approval. The proposed Salinity Plan will be circulated for no less than 30 days of public comment prior to the Regional Water Board's consideration of the Salinity Plan. The Regional Water Board may revise the Salinity Plan prior to final approval.

Upon determination by the Regional Water Board that the Discharger has materially failed to comply with the approved Salinity Plan due to circumstances within its control, the monthly average effluent limitations for electrical conductivity specified in j.ii., above, shall become effective immediately.

k. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

### 2. Interim Effluent Limitations

a. **Mercury.** The total annual mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.92 pounds. This interim performance-based limitation shall be in effect until the Regional Water Board establishes final effluent limitations after adoption of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Methylmercury TMDL.

## B. Land Discharge Specifications

**[Not Applicable]**

## C. Reclamation Specifications

1. Offsite use of reclaimed water covered by this Order shall be limited to dust control and compaction by building contractors, and street sweeping. Additional offsite specific reclamation uses may be approved by the Executive Officer with the submission of a written report demonstrating, to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer, that the uses will be in compliance with the terms of the Order.

2. Reclaimed water shall be chlorinated secondary treated effluent. For disinfection, the median number of total coliform organisms in the water shall not exceed 23 MPN/100 ml, as determined from the bacteriological results of the last seven days for which analyses have been completed, and the number of coliform organisms shall not exceed 240 MPN/100 ml in any two consecutive samples.

3. Reclaimed water shall meet the criteria contained in Title 22, Division 4, CCR (section 60301, et seq.).

4. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.

5. Controls on use for construction shall follow Guideline for Use of Reclaimed Water For Construction Purposes, as follows:

    a. Truck drivers should be instructed as to the reclamation specifications and potential health hazards involved with reuse of wastewater.
    b. Tank trucks and other equipment, which come into contact with reclaimed water, should be clearly identified with warning signs/placards.
    c. Tank trucks used for reclaimed water should be thoroughly cleaned of septage or other contaminants prior to reuse.
    d. Use of reclaimed water should not create any odor or nuisance.
    e. Ponding or runoff of reclaimed water should not occur.
    f. Aerosol formation during uses involving spraying should be minimized.
    g. Reclaimed water should be applied so as to prevent public contact with water.
    h. Reclaimed water must not be introduced into any permanent piping system and no connection shall be made between the tank truck and any part of a domestic water system.
    i. Tank trucks should be cleaned and disinfected after the project is completed.
    j. Tank trucks used to transport reclaimed water shall not be used to carry domestic water.

6. Treated wastewater discharged for reclamation for purposes not specified in this section must be regulated under separate waste discharge requirements and must meet the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22.

## V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

### A. Surface Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. The discharge shall not cause the following in the San Joaquin River:

1. **Bacteria**. The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than ten percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL

2. **Biostimulatory Substances**. Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

3. **Chemical Constituents**. Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

4. **Color**. Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

5. **Dissolved Oxygen**:

   a. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 6.0 mg/L any time from 1 September through 30 November.
   b. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 5.0 mg/L at any time from 1 December through 31 August.

6. **Floating Material**. Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

7. **Oil and Grease**. Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

8. **pH**. The pH to be depressed below 6.5, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units. A 1-month averaging period may be applied when calculating the pH change of 0.5.

9. **Pesticides**:

   a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
   b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;

c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by USEPA or the Executive Officer;
d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR §131.12.).
e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels set forth in CCR, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15; and
g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.

10. **Radioactivity**:

    a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
    b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the maximum contaminant levels specified in Table 64443 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the CCR.

11. **Suspended Sediments**. The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

12. **Settleable Substances**. Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

13. **Suspended Material**. Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

14. **Taste and Odors**. Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

15. **Temperature**. The Thermal Plan is applicable to this discharge. The Thermal Plan requires that the discharge shall not cause the following in the San Joaquin River:

    a. The creation of a zone, defined by water temperatures of more than 1°F above natural receiving water temperature, which exceeds 25 percent of the cross-sectional area of the river channel at any point; and

    b. A surface water temperature rise greater than 4°F above the natural temperature of the receiving water at any time or place;

16. **Toxicity**. Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.

17. **Turbidity**. The turbidity to increase as follows:

    a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
    b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
    c. More than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
    d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

    When wastewater is treated to a tertiary level (including coagulation) or equivalent, a 1-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance with this Receiving Surface Water Limitation for turbidity.

## B. Groundwater Limitations

1. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not cause or contribute to, in combination with other sources of the waste constituents, groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain:

    a. Taste or odor-producing constituents, toxic substances, or any other constituents, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses;

    b. Waste constituent concentrations in excess of water quality objectives or background water quality, whichever is greater; and

    c. Waste constituent concentrations in excess of the concentrations specified below or background water quality, whichever is greater:

        i. Fecal coliform organisms median of 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any seven-day period; and

        ii. Nitrate plus Nitrite as nitrogen of 10 mg/L.

2. Groundwater Limitations B.1.b and c become effective upon completion of the requirements specified in Provision VI.C.2.c of this Order.

## VI. PROVISIONS

### A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order.

2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:

   a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, Division 3, Chapter 26.

   b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:

      i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;

      ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;

      iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and

      iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

      The causes for modification include:

      - *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.

      - *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.

      - *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 CFR 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

      The Regional Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Regional Water Board's own motion.

   c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under Section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in

the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Regional Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under Sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:

   i. contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or

   ii. controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

   The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.

f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal, and adequate public notification to downstream water agencies or others who might contact the non-complying discharge.

g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by USEPA under Section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.

h. The discharge of any radiological, chemical or biological warfare agent or high-level, radiological waste is prohibited.

i. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.

j. Safeguard to electric power failure:

   i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.

ii. Upon written request by the Regional Water Board the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Regional Water Board.

iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.

k. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under Regional Water Board Standard Provision VI.A.2.m.

The technical report shall:

i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.

ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.

iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Regional Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

l. A publicly owned treatment works (POTW) whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry